



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,171	01/17/2002	Shinji Negishi	09792909-5310	3180
26263	7590	08/03/2007	EXAMINER	
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP			STEVENS, ROBERT	
P.O. BOX 061080			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER			2162	
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080			MAIL DATE DELIVERY MODE	
			08/03/2007 PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	10/052,171	Applicant(s)	NEGISHI ET AL.
Examiner	Robert Stevens	Art Unit	2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 May 2007.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,4-6,9-12,14-27 and 77-86 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1, 4-6, 9-12, 14-27 and 77-86 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Office withdraws the previous rejections of the claims under 35 USC §§101, 112-2nd paragraph and 103(a), in light of the amendment. However, the Office sets forth new rejections of the claims under 35 USC §103(a), in light of the amendment.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 5/21/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the previous rejections of claims 1-10, 12-22, 24-27 and 77-86 under 35 USC §103(a) Applicant argues on pages 11-12 that the cited references do not teach script substitution.

The Office respectfully disagrees. It is noted that the last line of the Harrington passage referenced by Applicant discussed substitution with a server side Visual Basic script.

Regarding the previous rejections of claims 11 and 23 under 35 USC §103(a) Applicant argues on pages 12-13 that the cited references do not teach script substitution.

The Office respectfully disagrees for the reasons noted immediately above.

For at least these reasons, the Office asserts the rejections of the claims as set forth below.

Claim Objections

3. **Claims 15 and 22 and objected to because of the following informalities:** Line 2 of claim 15 contains a repeated word (i.e., "the the document". Line 7 of claim 22 contains a repeated word (i.e., "the the received data". Appropriate correction of all such informalities is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1, 4-6, 9-10, 12, 14-22, 25-27 and 77-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Britton (US Patent No. 6,591,289, filed Jul. 27, 1999 and issued Jul. 8, 2003, hereafter referred to as "Britton") in view of Harrington et al (US Patent No. 6,775,820, filed Nov. 29, 2000 and issued Aug. 10, 2004, hereafter referred**

to as "Harrington") and Ian Douglas Agranat ("Engineering Web Technologies for Embedded Applications", IEEE Internet Computing, Vol. 2, Issue 3, May/Jun 1998, pp. 40-45, hereafter referred to as "Agranat") and Jesse S. Harriott ("Using JavaScript to Build a Psychology Practice Exam", Behavior Research Methods, Instruments and Computers, Vol. 29, No. 2, © 1997, pp. 232-236, hereafter referred to as "Harriott").

Regarding independent claim 1, Britton discloses: ***An apparatus comprising a receiving unit for receiving a document and a script as received data, (See the Britton Abstract, disclosing a client computer providing a template file, including a script, to a server.) a memory for storing at least the script of the received data, the memory being located on a server configured to receive and send data to a client;*** (See the Britton Abstract and Figure 3 #44 and #46, disclosing the use of memory in the form of files and database servers. It is further inherent that the Figure 3 #42 Web Server had memory for storing the script in order to execute that script. see also Figure 3 #48, disclosing a script interpreter for executing a script and outputting a converted document #45c', which was sent to the client #60 in response to the client's request #602.)

However, Britton does not explicitly disclose script substitution, as claimed. Harrington, though, teaches ***computer-readable code for substituting the script calling portion in the document with a portion for calling the script stored in said memory.*** (See the Harrington Abstract and Figure 5 [especially #520 and #524],

Art Unit: 2162

disclosing a process for recoding of scripts and which discloses script conversions, such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic Script. Additionally, see the Harrington reference at column 7 lines 30-35, which provides an example of an insertion of a script calling line into an HTML file, after identification of JavaScript code [at column 5 lines 24-26, for example]. This script calling portion is represented as a "meta'http-equiv" statement that calls a cgi script file that was assigned to the "URL" attribute of the "meta http-equiv" statement.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Harrington for the benefit of Britton, because to do so would have allowed a programmer to implement applications that were compatible with browsers running on an OS/2 platform, as taught by Harrington in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming.

However, Britton does not explicitly disclose the remaining limitations as claimed. Agranat, though, teaches ***computer-readable code configured to execute the script stored in memory in response to a request from the client, wherein the execution of the script generates a signal to control a device.*** (See the Agranat page 44 Figure 7, teaching the use of a script for setting a temperature setting.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Agranat for the benefit of Britton in view of Harrington, because to do so would have allowed a system designer to implement a

Web interface for remote diagnostics of products in the field, as taught by Agranat in the second paragraph of page 40. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming.

However, Britton does not explicitly disclose the remaining limitations as claimed. Harriott, though, teaches ***the document including a script calling portion;*** (See Harriott in the 3rd and 4th paragraphs of the section entitled "JavaScript Objects" on pages 232-233, discussing the two well-known options for incorporating scripts into HTML documents. The 4th paragraph discusses the use of a "SRC" attribute for calling, rather than embedding, a script within an HTML document.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Harriott for the benefit of Britton in view of Harrington and Agranat, because to do so would have allowed a programmer to implement a system which added interactive features to web pages while easing bandwidth requirements, decreasing server load and reducing server security risks, as taught by Harriott in the first paragraph on page 232 ("Today the Web ..."). These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming.

Regarding claim 4, Britton discloses: ***wherein the conversion apparatus is a relay server for sending and receiving data to/from a client.*** (See Britton in Figure 3, showing a web server #42 for relaying data to/from client #60.)

Regarding claim 5, Britton discloses: *wherein memory stores the document.*

(See Britton in Figure 3, showing a web server #42 – it having been implicit that such servers had memory for storing documents in order that the servers could return these documents.)

Claims 6 and 9 are directed to a method implemented by the apparatus of claims 1 and 5, respectively. As such, these claim are substantially similar to claims 1 and 5, respectively, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding independent claim 10, Britton discloses: *A script conversion system comprising a relay server for sending and receiving data to and from at least one client, said script conversion system being used for requesting a document and displaying the requested document by said client,* (See the Britton Abstract, discussing a client/server arrangement for providing a template file that includes a script.) ***said relay server*** (See Britton Figure 3 #42 Web Server.) ***comprising: receiving a document and a script,*** (See the Britton Abstract, discussing a system for providing a template file that includes a script) ***storing the script in a storage unit,*** (See Britton Fig. 3, teaching the use of memory in the form of file #44 and database #46 servers. It was also inherent that the Web server #42, would have memory for storing the script in order to execute that script.) ***and outputting a resulting document as a converted document;*** (See Britton Fig. 3 #48, teaching a

script interpreter for executing a script and outputting a converted document #45c', which is sent to the client #60 in response to client's request #602.) ***and a script execution unit for executing the script, wherein said relay server sends the converted document to said client, and the script called by said client is executed by said script execution unit.*** (See Britton Fig. 3 #48, teaching a script interpreter for executing a script and outputting a converted document #45c', which is sent to the client #60 in response to client's request #602.)

However, Britton does not explicitly disclose script substitution, as claimed. Harrington, though, teaches ***a conversion unit for extracting at least the script from the received data and storing the script in a storage unit, substituting a script calling portion in the document with a portion for calling the script stored in said storage unit,*** (See the Harrington Abstract and Figure 5 [especially #520 and #524], disclosing a process for recoding of scripts and which discloses script conversions, such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic Script. Additionally, see the Harrington reference at column 7 lines 30-35, which provides an example of an insertion of a script calling line into an HTML file, after identification of JavaScript code [at column 5 lines 24-26, for example]. This script calling portion is represented as a "meta http-equiv" statement that calls a cgi script file that was assigned to the "URL" attribute of the "meta http-equiv" statement.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Harrington for the benefit of Britton, because to do so

would have allowed a programmer to implement applications that were compatible with browsers running on an OS/2 platform, as taught by Harrington in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming.

However, Britton does not explicitly disclose the remaining limitations as claimed. Agranat, though, teaches ***wherein the execution of the script generates a signal to control a device.*** (See the Agranat page 44 Figure 7, teaching the use of a script for setting a temperature setting.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Agranat for the benefit of Britton in view of Harrington, because to do so would have allowed a system designer to implement a Web interface for remote diagnostics of products in the field, as taught by Agranat in the second paragraph of page 40. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming.

However, Britton does not explicitly disclose the remaining limitations as claimed. Harriott, though, teaches ***with the document including a script calling portion;*** (See Harriott in the 3rd and 4th paragraphs of the section entitled "JavaScript Objects" on pages 232-233, discussing the two well-known options for incorporating scripts into HTML documents. The 4th paragraph discusses the use of a "SRC" attribute for calling, rather than embedding, a script within an HTML document.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Harriott for the benefit of Britton in view of Harrington and Agranat, because to do so would have allowed a programmer to implement a system which added interactive features to web pages while easing bandwidth requirements, decreasing server load and reducing server security risks, as taught by Harriott in the first paragraph on page 232 ("Today the Web ..."). These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming.

Regarding claim 12, Britton discloses: ***wherein said relay server receives the document directly from a document storage server or*** (See Britton in Figure 4, showing file server #44 having documents for a client to view, and database server #46 containing records of past client interactions.)

Regarding claim 14, Britton discloses the storing and display of scripts. (See Britton Figure 2, teaching a file server #44 and database server #46, each of which stores files. The Office respectfully notes that the specific file format [e.g., HTML document, script, etc.] of the data does not affect the storage capability of the storage devices, and the actual storage location was merely an obvious variant. See Britton Figure 2 #60, showing a browser for display.)

However, Britton does not explicitly disclose script substitution, as claimed. Harrington, though, teaches script substitution. (See the Harrington Abstract and Figure 5 [especially #520 and #524], disclosing a process for recoding of scripts and which discloses script conversions, such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic Script. Additionally, see the Harrington reference at column 7 lines 30-35, which provides an example of an insertion of a script calling line into an HTML file, after identification of JavaScript code [at column 5 lines 24-26, for example]. This script calling portion is represented as a "meta http-equiv" statement that calls a cgi script file that was assigned to the "URL" attribute of the "meta http-equiv" statement.)

Regarding claims 15-16, Britton discloses storing documents on multiple servers. (See Britton Figure 2, teaching a file server #44 and database server #46, each of which stores files. The Office respectfully notes that the specific file format [e.g., HTML document, script, etc.] of the data does not affect the storage capability of the storage devices, and the actual storage location was merely an obvious variant. See Britton Figure 2 #60, showing a browser for display.)

Regarding claim 17, Britton discloses execution and display of documents. (See Britton in Figure 3 #45c', showing the returning of a server-executed document, and in column 8 lines 1-7, discussing sending #45c' to the client's browser.)

Regarding claim 18, Britton discloses a client authentication process. (See Britton in Figure 4, showing a client login GUI incorporating a user ID and password. It was implicit that if one were employing a login screen, that one was authenticating access against a list of allowed users.)

Regarding claim 19, Britton discloses the use of a database server having, inter alia, a list of records concerning customer/client orders. (See Britton in column 8 lines 33-54, describing an on-line ordering system. It was implicit that an ordering system would have been tied in with a billing system, so that clients placing orders for goods/services could also pay for those services. Britton further discloses the returning of a server-executed document as #45c' in Fig. 3 and in col. 8 lines 1-7, which discusses sending 45c' to the client's browser. It was also inherent that a client device would have been capable of executing that received document, especially in light of Fig. 3 client browser #65, which was executed on client #60, and which operated on documents such as #45c'.)

Regarding claim 20, Britton discloses accounting means. (See Britton in Figure 4 #49, showing a database server for storing database records. The records of element #49 provide a mechanism for storing client orders, as explained in col. 9 lines 19-27. Further, col. 9 lines 1-14 describe the updating of a customer account based on transactions made by the customer.)

Regarding dependent claim 21, Britton discloses a server for storing documents in advance. (See Britton Figure 3 #44, showing a file server. File servers are well-known for storing files in advance.)

Regarding independent claim 22, Britton discloses: *A script conversion method for requesting from at least one client to a document server to send a document via a relay server and displaying the requested document in said client and for displaying the received document*, (See the Britton Abstract, discussing a client/server arrangement for providing a template file that includes a script) *receiving the document and a script as received data from said document server by said relay server*; (See Britton Figure 3 #42 Web Server.) *storing the script in a storage unit*; (See Britton Fig. 3, teaching the use of memory in the form of file #44 and database #46 servers. It was also inherent that the Web server #42, would have memory for storing the script in order to execute that script.) *outputting a resulting document; sending the document to said client*; (Britton further discloses in Fig. 3 #48 a script interpreter for executing a script and outputting a converted document #45c', which is sent to the client #60 in response to client's request #602, and subsequently displayed in a browser) *and executing, on the relay server, the script in the document called by said client*. (See Britton Fig. 3 #48, teaching a script interpreter for executing a script and outputting a converted document #45c', which is sent to the client #60 in response to client's request #602.)

However, Britton does not explicitly disclose script conversion, extraction and substitution, as claimed. Harrington, though, teaches ***conversion means for extracting at least the script from the received data and storing the script in storage means, substituting the script calling portion in the document with a portion for calling the script stored in said storage unit,*** (See the Harrington Abstract and Figure 5 [especially #520 and #524], disclosing a process for recoding of scripts and which discloses script conversions, such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic Script. Additionally, see the Harrington reference at column 7 lines 30-35, which provides an example of an insertion of a script calling line into an HTML file, after identification of JavaScript code [at column 5 lines 24-26, for example]. This script calling portion is represented as a "meta http-equiv" statement that calls a cgi script file that was assigned to the "URL" attribute of the "meta http-equiv" statement.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Harrington for the benefit of Britton, because to do so would have allowed a programmer to implement applications that were compatible with browsers running on an OS/2 platform, as taught by Harrington in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming:

However, Britton does not explicitly disclose the remaining limitations as claimed. Agranat, though, teaches ***wherein the execution of the script generates a signal to***

control a device. (See the Agranat page 44 Figure 7, teaching the use of a script for setting a temperature setting.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Agranat for the benefit of Britton in view of Harrington, because to do so would have allowed a system designer to implement a Web interface for remote diagnostics of products in the field, as taught by Agranat in the second paragraph of page 40. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming.

However, Britton does not explicitly disclose the remaining limitations as claimed. Harriott, though, teaches ***the document including a script calling portion;*** (See Harriott in the 3rd and 4th paragraphs of the section entitled "JavaScript Objects" on pages 232-233, discussing the two well-known options for incorporating scripts into HTML documents. The 4th paragraph discusses the use of a "SRC" attribute for calling, rather than embedding, a script within an HTML document.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Harriott for the benefit of Britton in view of Harrington and Agranat, because to do so would have allowed a programmer to implement a system which added interactive features to web pages while easing bandwidth requirements, decreasing server load and reducing server security risks, as taught by Harriott in the first paragraph on page 232 ("Today the Web ..."). These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming.

Regarding dependent claim 25, Britton discloses storing of documents on servers. (See Britton Figure 2, teaching a file server #44 and database server #46, each of which stores files. The Office respectfully notes that the specific file format [e.g., HTML document, script, etc.] of the data does not affect the storage capability of the storage devices, and the actual storage location was merely an obvious variant. See Britton Figure 2 #60, showing a browser for display.)

However, Britton does not explicitly teach script substitution, as claimed. Harrington, though, discloses the recoding of scripts. (See the Harrington Abstract and Fig. 5 elements #520 and 524, teaching that this recoding process encompasses script conversions, such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic Script. This process is further taught in col. 6 lines 31-50, describing an extraction process of the original script code. Additionally, see the Harrington reference at column 7 lines 30-35, which provides an example of an insertion of a script calling line into an HTML file, after identification of JavaScript code [at column 5 lines 24-26, for example]. This script calling portion is represented as a "meta http-equiv" statement that calls a cgi script file that was assigned to the "URL" attribute of the "meta http-equiv" statement.)

Claim 26 is substantially similar to claim 12, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding claim 27, Britton discloses storing of documents on multiple servers.

(See Britton Figure 2, showing a file server #44 and a database server #46. The Examiner respectfully notes that the specific file format (e.g., HTML document, script, etc.) of the data does not affect the storage capability of the storage devices.)

Regarding dependent claim 77, Britton discloses executing a script upon a client request. (See Britton Figure 3 #48, showing a script interpreter.)

Regarding dependent claim 78, Britton discloses the recited limitations. (See Britton Figure 4, showing a web server #48 for receiving a client document/request and file server #44 and a data base server #46 for storing documents. It was well-known for computers, such as web server #48, to provide a caching capability.)

Regarding dependent claim 79, Britton discloses sending a document to a client. (See Britton Fig. 3 #45c'.)

However, Britton does not explicitly teach conversion and script substitution, as claimed. Harrington, though, discloses these limitations. (See the Harrington Abstract and Figure 5, teaching the recoding of scripts, i.e., portions of documents, in the Abstract and also in Fig. 5. It would have been inherent at the time of the invention to parse or extract the scripts of Harrington. Elements #520 and 524, as well as the Abstract, further indicate that this recoding process encompasses script conversions,

such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic Script. This process is further taught in col. 6 lines 31-50, describing an extraction process of the original script code. Additionally, see the Harrington reference at column 7 lines 30-35, which provides an example of an insertion of a script calling line into an HTML file, after identification of JavaScript code [at column 5 lines 24-26, for example]. This script calling portion is represented as a "meta http-equiv" statement that calls a cgi script file that was assigned to the "URL" attribute of the "meta http-equiv" statement.)

Regarding dependent claim 80, Britton discloses sending a document to a client. (See Britton Fig. 3 #45c'.)

However, Britton does not explicitly teach conversion and script substitution, as claimed. Harrington, though, discloses these limitations. (See the Harrington Abstract and Figure 5, teaching the recoding of scripts, i.e., portions of documents, in the Abstract and also in Fig. 5. It would have been inherent at the time of the invention to parse or extract the scripts of Harrington. Elements #520 and 524, as well as the Abstract, further indicate that this recoding process encompasses script conversions, such as from JavaScript to Visual Basic Script. This process is further taught in col. 6 lines 31-50, describing an extraction process of the original script code. Additionally, see the Harrington reference at column 7 lines 30-35, which provides an example of an insertion of a script calling line into an HTML file, after identification of JavaScript code [at column 5 lines 24-26, for example]. This script calling portion is represented as a

Art Unit: 2162

"meta http-equiv" statement that calls a cgi script file that was assigned to the "URL" attribute of the "meta http-equiv" statement.)

Claims 81-82, 83-84 and 85-86 are substantially similar to claims 79-80, and therefore likewise rejected.

6. **Claims 11 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Britton (US Patent No. 6,591,289, filed Jul. 27, 1999 and issued Jul. 8, 2003, hereafter referred to as "Britton") in view of Harrington et al (US Patent No. 6,775,820, filed Nov. 29, 2000 and issued Aug. 10, 2004, hereafter referred to as "Harrington") and further in view of Ian Douglas Agranat ("Engineering Web Technologies for Embedded Applications", IEEE Internet Computing, Vol. 2, Issue 3, May/Jun 1998, pp. 40-45, hereafter referred to as "Agranat"), Jesse S. Harriott ("Using JavaScript to Build a Psychology Practice Exam", Behavior Research Methods, Instruments and Computers, Vol. 29, No. 2, © 1997, pp. 232-236, hereafter referred to as "Harriott") and Bickmore et al (US Patent No. 6,857,102, provisionally filed Apr. 7, 1998 and issued Feb. 15, 2005, hereafter referred to as "Bickmore").

Regarding dependent claim 11, Britton does not explicitly teach the use of personal communication terminals, as claimed. Bickmore, though, teaches this limitation. (See the Bickmore Abstract and col. 4 lines 45-54, disclosing the well-known use of a personal communication terminal as a client device. The Examiner further notes that Bickmore teaches the use of scripting in col. 3 lines 29-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Bickmore for the benefit of Britton in view of Harrington, Agranat and Harriott, because to do so would have allowed a programmer to re-author documents designed for a larger display area for display on a smaller display area, as taught by Bickmore in col. 3 lines 60-63, and would have taught a designer to employ a server to provide transformation services to conserve wireless bandwidth and device memory, as further taught by Bickmore in col. 3 lines 5-9 in the context of col. 3 lines 22-24. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., web-based programming.

Claim 23 is substantially similar to claim 11, and therefore likewise rejected.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Non-Patent Literature

Kristensen, Anders, "Template Resolution in XML/HTML", HPL-1999-42, HP Laboratories Bristol, Mar. 1999, pp. i and 1-16.

US Patent Application Publications

Carpenter et al 2005/0177753

US Patents

Shen et al	7,207,000
Cloud	6,968,343

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Robert Stevens
Examiner
Art Unit 2162

July 25, 2007


SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER